DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 018 CS 010 764

AUTHOR Anders, Patricia L.
TITLE Collaborative Inquiry: Elements of Congruence and Dissonance.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperation; Criticism; Feminism; *Inservice Education; Intermediate Grades; *Interprofessional Relationship; Middle Schools; Reading Instruction; Reading Research; Research Needs; *Sex Role; *Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS Arizona (Tucson); *Collaborative Inquiry; *Feminist Criticism; School Culture

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the staff development process, a study examined the use of research in teaching reading comprehension by six teachers at two Tucson, Arizona middle schools. The schools employed both individual and group staff development, but while one school was considered to have a positive school culture, the other school was predicted to have a difficult group of teachers to work with. Findings suggest that faculty social norms have a major influence on the success of constructivist, potentially collaborative staff development. Examination of staff development conversations revealed five levels of discourse: (1) sharing (a teacher's description of a recalled practice); (2) show and tell (explanation of a practice that a teacher applied since the last meeting); (3) lecture 1 (a depersonalized presentation of a practice that emanated from the literature or observation); (4) lecture 2 (a depersonalized presentation of a practice that grew out of discussion); and (5) a new suggestion (a practice that grew out of discussion, which is presented with its theoretical base). Teachers played a larger role in discussions at one school than at the other. Gender differences appeared to play a role. Future collaborative research may provide a context for critical feminist theory and criticism, and move it from assimilation to a reinterpretation of activities traditionally viewed as "women's work." A need for school based research, exists but there are few rewards or outlets for collaborative researchers. Perhaps research perspectives will develop that provide for all educators' voices to be heard. (Three tables are included; 14 references are attached.) (SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341018

COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY: ELEMENTS OF CONGRUENCE AND DISSONANCE

Patricia L. Anders
University of Arizona
Spring, 1991

(A paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Conference, 1991, Chicago in a symposium, Ethical, Methodological, and Conceptual Issues in School/University Collaboration for Action and Research)

PROLOGUE

Since receiving my doctorate from the University of Wisconsin in 1976, I have been teaching teachers about the process of reading comprehension and composition, relating that knowledge base to classroom practices, conducting staff development in schools related to the teaching of reading and writing, and conducting research. In my classes I try to teach in ways that I believe teachers should teach. I try to make my classes inquiry oriented, I try to consistently relate theory, research and practice, and I try to develop a sense of questioning and wondering about teaching and learning with my students. I was trained as an experimental researcher, and many of my published studies reflect that paradigm. During the last three years, I have become increasingly dissatisfied with the shallowness of that paradigm and the limited questions it allows me to investigate; thus, I have moved toward inquiry that is more naturalistic and is far more sensitive to both teachers as people and professionals and the context within which they and their children work.

When I conducted my dissertation research, I was well

CS 010764

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Anders
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

acquainted with scholarly writing regarding gender issues. My dissertation dealt with readers' judgments of the credibility of women as authors of informative texts. One book chapter was written using the results of that chapter, but I was not able to publish the findings in a peer-reviewed journal. I soon looked for a topic that was more likely to enjoy acceptability in the journals in which I wanted (and needed) to publish. Thus, my interest and concern surrounding gender issues has been simmering on a back burner for some 15 years.

Since agreeing to write this paper, I have been reacquainting myself with some of the gender-related literature, and have been thinking about my work from some of those perspectives. I'm not sure where I have ended up, am afraid that what I am going to say has already been said by the others participating in this symposium, or is common knowledge to our audience. If that is the case, I hope our discussion will push me in directions that will take me beyond the mundane. But on a more positive side, I hope my experiences, data and insights will provide pieces that will fit into someone's notion of this topic.

INTRODUCTION

During the past three years I have been involved in two school based research projects that have been called by some as "collaborative," one of those two studies, the Reading Instruction Study, informs this paper. I did not identify these projects as collaborative, but others did. Thus, my initial interest in this topic. The identification of these projects as

collaborative made me wonder what the term meant to the folks using it? I also wondered: How is collaborative research different from other types of research? Where did this idea come from? Why are we hearing about it now? If this is an idea of value, what does it mean to me as a teacher educator and educational researcher?

During the winter of 1990, I had an opportunity to participate in a Whole Language Workshop here at the University of Arizona. Ken and Yetta Goodman, organizers of the Workshop, asked me to speak on the ethics of the "teacher as researcher" and collaborative research. I used that opportunity to "try out" some of the ideas for this paper, and also asked the participants to delineate their questions about collaborative research, their problems related to the topic, and ethical issues they perceived. This was a particularly suitable audience because participants typically hold advanced degrees, are experienced and are committed to advancing our understanding of teaching and learning. Here are their responses:

Workshop Participants' Questions:

1. What are operational definitions of research?
2. What are operational definitions of collaboration?
3. How do teachers incorporate conducting research in an already overwhelming schedule?
4. Reporting is an important part of research: How does a teacher have the time? How is she rewarded? To whom (or where) does she report?

Workshop Participants' Perceived Problems:

1. How does a teacher (researcher) learn about and acknowledge the work of others? (There's so much to know, that it seems unlikely that anyone can really keep up, especially without University library resources.)

2. How do the research questions get negotiated?

Workshop Participants' Ethical Issues:

1. The sharing of outcomes with participants. What if they are damaging, embarrassing, contradictory?

2. Whose questions are being researched?

3. When reporting, how does one honor and respect those doing the study and those being studied if school districts resist or refuse being named?

4. How do authors negotiate the order of authorship for their work?

5. Should studies be continued even if bad stuff is happening to kids and/or teachers?

6. Should we be working toward changing the culture of schooling to one where research, both the conducting and the reporting, is honored as a role and responsibility of teachers?

Interestingly, there were graduate students in the audience who offered the additional ethical questions:

7. Is collaborative research cheating?

8. Do University researchers "take advantage" of those with whom they work in the schools?

I can only guess the extent to which these educators' concerns and questions are similar to those raised by other educators; however, it seems that these are difficult questions that this symposium is designed to address.

Although important and related to my questions, I suggest that these questions relate to a larger issue of power, specifically in terms of three elements: a) the within-school peer social structure; b) the domains of knowledge and experience perceived to be the rightful possession of practitioners but not researchers and vice versa; and c) gender. I propose that these dimensions contribute to the perception of power teachers may or may not possess. Their perception of power necessarily affects the quality of their participation in collaborative research. Within the boundaries of these three elements, both congruence and dissonance can be found. Hopefully, articulation and reflection on these three elements will contribute to our understanding of the ethics of collaborative research.

With regard to the first element, within-school peer social structure, I argue that social dynamics play a critical role in the nature of teacher's participation in collaborative research. The second element, who is privileged to what types of knowledge, are described in the context of the Reading Instruction Study, where teachers were encouraged to talk about their practical knowledge. Results from that project suggest that teachers were reluctant to generalize or abstract their experience. I argue that researchers and teachers lacked a common language, and

therefore lacked the means to mediate their experiences within a project that aspired to be collaborative. Third, I argue that gender is a pervasive force within collaborative research. As a factor it is not discrete from the other two, but it needs its own place in this discussion because of it's potential influence.

To provide a context for elucidating these elements, I first outline the project from which these elements emerged. Next, each of the elements are presented and data from the project, other experiences, and related literature are used to develop my points.

The Context

During the years 1987-1990, Professor Virginia Richardson and I were funded by OERI to investigate teachers' use of research when teaching reading comprehension. We limited the study to teachers who taught grades 4, 5, and 6 and designed our research to answer 5 questions: (1) What are the research-based teaching of reading comprehension practices? (2) To what degree are teachers using research-based teaching of reading comprehension practices? (3) What are the barriers to the use of research-based practices? (4) Can a school-based staff development model affect teachers' use of research-based instruction of reading comprehension? and (5) Does the use of research-based teaching of reading practices affect student reading achievement in a positive direction?

The teachers with whom we worked represented six schools in two school districts in Tucson, Arizona. After notification of

funding, we approached the research offices of each of the districts, complied with their requirements for conducting research in their districts, and then approached individual teachers and principals who we believed might be interested in the project. All who we approached were interested, and we were invited to present the project to the faculty of each of the schools. Our presentation was designed to interest them in the project, and to solicit their input regarding the activities we were planning.

These six schools represented a cross-section of the general population of our community in their ethnic and SES compositions. They also represented a wide range of organizational characteristics. Five were part of the largest district in the State, and one school was located in a smaller district on the edge of town. Case studies of each of the schools were developed for our larger project. Three of the schools were designated as "experimental," one as a pilot, and two as "control" schools.

To answer question one, we conducted a literature search and compiled a list of 17 foci around which practices could be organized. The quality of research for each of the practices varied, and are being reported in a book being presently written by myself and Carol Lloyd. We planned to share these practices with teachers who agreed to work with us.

Question two, the extent to which intermediate grade teachers are using research-based reading comprehension practices, was investigated by using observation procedures that

provided narrative records of teachers' actions and statements during the teaching of reading. Each teacher was observed two times.

The third question, related to barriers to the use of research-based practices, was studied by exploring two types of barriers: teacher beliefs and knowledge about reading and the teaching of reading; and school level factors that may inhibit or enhance teacher change.

To define beliefs we used a definition derived from educational philosophers: a belief is a proposition or statement or relationship among things accepted as true (Fenstermacher, 1986; Green, 1971). Teachers were interviewed concerning their beliefs about and knowledge of reading,the teaching of reading, and instructional practice. An ethnographic approach to the belief interviews (Spradley, 1979) was used to analyze the interviews.

Three procedures were used to provide a description of school factors that could contribute to the use or non-use of research-based teaching of reading comprehension practices, and to predict the degree to which teachers would be willing to change their existing practices: a teacher questionnaire concerning organizational context, a principal interview on beliefs concerning teacher practice and change, qualitative descriptions of the school climate and organization, and nature of the reading curriculum.

Question four asked whether or not a staff development

program could affect teachers' use of research-based instruction of reading comprehension. To address this question, a school based staff development process was designed to provide a context for teachers' examination of their beliefs about and practices in the teaching of reading comprehension and to introduce alternative ways of thinking and practices.

In the school designated as the pilot and one identified as being particularly collegial, we introduced the results of the research to date, discussed with them the staff development process we were considering, and tried out a practical argument process with two of the teachers. We then asked for input and suggestions from the teachers. On the basis of information from this pilot, the process was developed further.

The staff development process consisted of two parts: individual and group. The individual component was a video tape of the teacher when she reported she was teaching reading comprehension. The video tape was then viewed by the researchers with the teacher. The viewing was focused on the practices the teacher employed and the discussion was about her rationale for the practice. During this discussion, empirical evidence that either supported or challenged the practices was shared. The group component consisted of all the grade 4, 5, and 6 teachers in each school who met with the researchers on a schedule suggested by the teachers. Teachers received University credit, released time from teaching or payment for their participation.

The group level staff development was conceptualized as a

constructive-type process. We envisioned meetings where teachers would talk about the practices they implemented and reflect on these practices. We hoped to serve as catalysts for these discussions, and also as models for reflection. We also hoped to provide knowledge related to theories of reading comprehension and to provide examples of practices that were supported by those theories. Agendas were established by focusing on topics that the teachers identified as important to them.

All staff development sessions were videotaped, and analysis of those videotapes provide valuable insights into the nature of teachers relationships with their peers and the language they use to describe their experiences.

To test the staff development model, faculty in the three schools were involved in the process; two during the fall of 1988, and one during the spring of 1989. During the Spring of 1989, the teachers were interviewed and videotaped to determine whether their beliefs and/or practices had changed, and changes in the school organizational factors were assessed. Due to problems with the school's physical plant, we were unable to collect consistent data from the third school. Thus, data presented in this paper reflect the staff development that occurred in two of the three "experimental" schools.

Finally to answer question five, we assessed student reading achievement in the classes of the teachers who participated in the study. We used two measures: the reading battery of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the Illinois Goal Assessment:

Reading. Forms of both tests appropriate to the students' grade levels were administered in the spring of 1987, 1988, and 1989.

The results of this study are reported (Richardson & Anders, 1990), and although the details are not relevant to this paper, the reader might like to know that overall the staff development process did work: teachers' changed in their reported beliefs and observed practices; changes occurred at an organizational level in all the schools; and children performed better on the Illinois instrument in the classrooms of teachers who participated in our study.

DIMENSIONS OF THE POWER ISSUE

School Level Peer Relationships

It is common knowledge among educators that school climate and social relationships within that climate is likely to affect the nature and success of attempts at teacher change. We certainly found that to be the case in our study. In the case of the two faculties being discussed here, our context study revealed two very different school climates.

One school, identified as School A in our report, was predicted to be a school with a positive school culture. The principal was considered a strong instructional leader; the teachers seemed collegial; and the student body seemed engaged in the learning process. Seven teachers, 4 males and 3 females, with a range of experience from 1 to 8 years, from school A participated. One male was a teacher of learning disabled children, two of the other males had 8 years experience, and the

third was in his third year of teaching. One of the female teachers was in her first year of teaching, another female teacher possessed the Ph.D. in Educational Administration and Foundations, and the third female teacher was in her fifth year of teaching. This school, described by the principal as serving an "upwardly mobile working class to middle class population of fist-time homeowners had an approximately equal number of Hispanics and Anglos among its 380 students. The school was built seven years ago in a rapidly growing area of the city. The school scored in the middle of the district range on the 1986-1987 Iowa tests, just below the 50th percentile.

The second school, identified as School F in our study was very different. On the basis of the school context study, we predicted that this would be a very difficult group of teachers with whom to work. The teachers reported not knowing each other very well, seldom had the opportunity to work together, observe each other, talk about practices or share materials. About the only common denominator among the group was a mistrust and dislike of the male principal, and the belief that many of their students came from homes that made it very difficult, if not impossible, for them to teach. All five of the female 4-6 grade teachers participated in the project and were each veteran teachers with more than ten years experience. While School A teachers wanted University credit for their participation, School F teachers voted to receive released time from their teaching, and to meet during several afternoons away from school. School F

was built in 1929, and was in need of renovation and remodeling. The Hispanic population of the intermediate level was only about 10-12%, and the scores of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, like School A, were average.

One of our analyses, suggests that the staff development process in both schools went through three stages: Introductory, Breakthrough, and Empowerment. The Introductory stage was characterized as a time when the teachers familiarized themselves with each other, their philosophies, and their ways of thinking. During this time, they did not ask questions of each other, but rather politely listened to the conversation. Also during this time, the staff developers talked quite a bit about general practices and pressed the teachers to describe their classroom practices. The Breakthrough stage occurred when a person or persons moved through a line of thinking, or a way of doing things to a new way of thinking about the topic. At this stage teachers asked "do you" questions. "Do you do literature groups?" or "When do you do skills?" When these questions were asked, all the teachers began to offer their options and suggestions. Another characteristic of this stage was when one or more of the teachers would reflect on their own experience as a reader. Through sharing these personal reflections, teachers began to see a connection between what they did in their classroom and students' reading habits and attitudes. At the same time, the staff developers participated less, more often listening than talking, behaving as participants rather than

leaders. The Empowerment stage was when the teachers claimed ownership of the staff development itself. It was in this stage that the staff development conversation was dominated by teachers. They arranged agendas, asked the questions and/or answered the questions and generally directed the sessions' foci.

After considerable contact with School A, we sensed that School A's collegiality was social only, and that the code of conduct that was operating inhibited the open, honest and frank discussions we were hoping to promote. The teachers believed that they each taught reading differently, and they found it uncomfortable to discuss their beliefs and practices in front of each other. They pushed the staff developers to "tell them how to teach reading," rather than examine their own beliefs and practices and work with the staff developers as consultants. Analysis of the staff development video-tapes reveal that the teachers readily deferred to the teacher who held the Ph.D. and to the two males who taught sixth grade. Those three teachers often set the tone for the discussions, and were persuasive in their position that the staff developers "were from the University, had time to study research, and were obligated to tell the teachers what to do."

The code of conduct operating did not allow teachers to enter the rooms of colleagues; did not permit a teacher to talk about the rationale for a practice with another teacher; and promoted the maintenance of the social atmosphere above all.

This finding is particularly relevant to our discussion of

the ethics of collaborative research. This project required that colleagues enter into a scholarly dialogue about their practices, yet to do so risked the loosely coupled and fragile social relationships among the teachers. If practices and ideas are not information that can be shared and critically discussed, how is one to refine one's thinking and practice? How is one to reflect? How is one to use language to better understand and to make explicit tacit knowledge? Schon (1983) and others have discussed the tacit knowledge of professionals, how is that knowledge to become part of the arena of ideas if they are not allowed to be talked about? And who is responsible for the potential breakdown of the social structure of the school if the norms change?

In School A, 8 sessions occurred before the Breakthrough, and Empowerment, session 11, was the last time we met--at the teacher's choice. We believe that the staff development program clearly challenged what Lortie identified as the "individualism" norm. These teachers had negotiated a safe environment, where whatever one believed or did was acceptable, and not to be questioned: "That's the way he/she teaches, it's not how I would teach, but that's OK because it works for him/her, but it wouldn't work for me."

In contrast, School F quickly moved through the Introductory Stage, only 2 sessions, and spent the majority of their 8 sessions in the Breakthrough Stage, with the Empowerment Stage occurring during the next to the last session, session 7. They

had little invested in collegiality, and were very frank and open about how they taught and why they did what they did. One of the younger teachers was an advocate of whole language, although she did not possess much practical knowledge about being a whole language teacher. She had lots of questions and was experimenting in her class and taking advantage of opportunities locally to learn more. She shared her questions and frustrations and all participated in helping her think through her issues.

The experience in these two schools suggest that social norms of a faculty have a major influence on the success of a constructivist and potentially collaborative approach to staff development, and that these social norms are far more complicated than merely whether or not the teachers "like" each other or have high expectations of their students. School A teachers reported "liking" each other, but behaved as if their relationships could not withstand substantive conversation. School A teachers also had high expectations of their students. School F teachers did not know if they "liked" each other, and did not particularly care whether or not they did, and had low expectations of their students. The effective schools research (Little, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1985) would have predicted that School A would be the one in which the constructive-type staff development would work best and that School F would have been the difficult school, but our experience and analyses suggest that this was not the case. In summary, then social norms seem to either enhance or mitigate the power teachers have to develop in ways that have the

potential of improving their practice.

Knowledge and Language

Two data sources are drawn from to elaborate on this dimension of power. One is a comparison of the types of research-based practices that appear in the literature with the types of practices teachers were interested in knowing about, and the second is a summary of the discourse analyses conducted of the types of talk that occurred during the group staff development meetings.

Comparison of practices. Collaborative research and teacher as researcher has a long history. John Dewey (1929) promoted collaborative research as early as 1908, and others associated with the progressive movement have continually promoted the construct. However, when Kamil described the reading research community in the Handbook of Reading Research (1984) he included three types of researchers: the experimentalists, the practitioners, and the translators. The experimentalists were described as basic researchers who investigate the reading process, the practitioners were described as those who were looking for "what to do tomorrow morning" and methods of evaluation; and the translators were described as those who interpret basic research for teachers and administrators to address instructional problems. It is noteworthy that he left out the notion of collaborative research and completely ignored the notion of teacher as researcher. This may be indicative of the attitudes held by many university-related researchers: they

don't acknowledge the construct of teacher-as-researcher, let alone collaborative research between university researchers and teachers.

Of course, not all University researchers share Kamil's view. Ann Berthoff (1981) writes that "educational research is nothing to our purpose, unless we formulate the questions; if the procedures by which answers are sought are not dialectic and dialogic, that is to say, if the questions and the answers are not continually reformulated by those who are working in the classroom, educational research is pointless (p. 31). This point is really driven home when one compares the topics explored by educational researchers and contrasted with those topics discussed by teachers in the staff development process described above. By examining Table One, it is apparent that the researchers predominately studied instructional variables that were easily controlled: vocabulary and text; while the teachers wanted to explore topics related to motivation, questioning, and students' background knowledge.

These data suggest that many practices presented in the research literature are far removed from actual practice, often to such an extent that they seem irrelevant to the practicing community. The factors and variables that are controlled in these simplistic designs are likely to be the very ones that matter most to teachers. McDonald (1986) discusses this problem when he writes "Most theory about teaching. . . supposes that teaching is at best simply the rational application of means to

given ends. In this light, all the ambiguity, irrationality, and conflict which teachers are use to feeling in their bones, if not used to talking about, are simply evidence of teaching failure" (p. 377). It appears that the research is simply and necessarily not sufficient to respond to the complex issues of instruction and learning.

Staff Development Talk About Practices. We conducted elaborate analyses of the staff development discourse to answer three categories of questions: a) What percentage of the conversation was controlled by the staff developers and by the teachers? Were there differences from one session to the next? Between the two schools? b) What was the content of the staff development sessions? What were the themes of conversation and whose were they? and c) How were classroom practices introduced into the conversation? Who introduced them? What additional conversation ensued from the discussion of a practice? Were the described practices embedded in theory?

The first stage of our analysis revealed five categories of discourse mode observed in each of the staff development schools: a) sharing, this came about when one participant was reminded of something s/he does or has done in the past, and talks about it with the rest of the participants. It was usually described in a personal, at time hesitant manner; b) show and tell, a prepared presentation about a practice that was done by the teacher since the previous meeting, s/he usually brought examples of student work or other materials to support the use of the practice; c)

lecture 1, was a depersonalized presentation of a practice, the practice usually emanated from either observation or the literature; d) lecture 2, a formal presentation about a practice that grew out of a discussion, was not prepared in advance, but is presented in a depersonalized manner; and e) a new suggestion, was a practice that grew out of the discussion, usually presented with its theoretical base, but not a specific research base. We also analyzed the proportion of Staff Developer Talk (SDT), Staff Developer Initiated Teacher Talk (SDTIT), Teacher Initiatated Teacher Talk (TITT), and Discussion.

Table 2 points out the types of practices presented by the staff developers and the teachers. In School A, teachers presented nearly twice as many practices as we did. That was because we would usually start the session asking what had been tried that week, and how it had gone. Although we asked the same type of opening question in School F, their responses tended to lead the group into a discussion more readily than did the responses of the teachers from School A. Table 3 points out the proportion of types of talk by the teachers and staff developers in the two schools. Comparing each of the columns, our suspicions are confirmed: the teachers from School F controlled much more of the conversation than did the teachers from School A.

These differences between teachers and researchers may suggest that teachers and researchers do not share a common language or common concerns. It is not that teachers lack a

language; rather no one has been listening. As we all know, few forums exist in which to speak or write, and the climate in which teachers work is often a chilly one for fostering that articulation.

Summary of Staff Development Discourse.

One consistent theme that ran through the discussions in School A was that we staff developers from the University had the time and the expertise to understand theories and practices, and that we were obligated to share that information. We were more than willing to do so, but only in response to the context within which the teachers worked. Thus, we wanted to weave our knowledge and expertise into the questions asked by the teachers. As demonstrated above, the teachers in this school were reluctant to risk letting us, or their colleagues, in on what their questions were.

As staff developers, we often promoted the value of practical knowledge and that empirical knowledge was insufficient for teachers outside practical contexts. Teachers acknowledged their practical knowledge, but did not share it to any great extent. Predictably whenever we did present empirically-based practices, participants told us that those practices weren't useful or relevant because of certain contextual constraints. These constraints were usually presented in the form of school board or administrative requirements, parental expectations, or requirements for student performance on standardized tests and grading.

School F did not exhibit the same pattern. During those meetings, practices were discussed frankly and in detail. Probing questions were asked and participants agreed and disagreed with each other constructively. However, the theory that all but one of the teachers espoused was often expressed in terms of motivation, classroom measurement, or evaluation. As the staff development sessions progressed there was an increased inclusion of theory related to schema theory and whole language,[1] and evidence of those notions were evident in teacher's exit interviews.

We wonder why teachers in School A were so willing to abdicate their knowledge, and from an ethical perspective we wonder what we could have or should have done about it.

Gender

It's been hard throughout the presentation of the two previous dimensions to not discuss gender. It seems that gender is likely to have played a role in both the social climate in each of the schools, and the language and knowledge characteristics of the staff development process.

Gilligan (1982) proposes that middle age women are likely to become more independent as their responsibilities for nurturing lessen. It's interesting to note that School F teachers were

---

[1]As staff developers, we emphasized the importance of prior knowledge for reading comprehension; the importance of providing activities and discussions to help readers connect ideas within text and between prior knowledge and the text, and the relationship between reading and writing.

older and more mature. They might well have been mirroring the "adolescence" of middle-age and were therefore more willing to risk independence in their thinking. It would have been interesting if males had been present, as they were in School A. Also the teachers in School A were younger, with the exception of the woman who possessed the Ph.D. These female teachers were interested in maintaining their relationships, at apparently nearly all costs. Virginia and I (middle aged female staff developers) were criticized by the female teachers for being too frank and for being too critical--that criticism never emerged in School F. None of the four males articulated concern about our manner, in fact one said that the staff development sessions were very stimulating and had pushed his thinking in new and exciting ways. At one particular session I was very direct in my response to a male teacher who was describing his students in ways that I believed were demeaning. He and I talked about it for a minute and then the conversation moved on. The next week, the first year female teacher defended the male teacher and said that I had been rude and unfair to him. . .Her response seems to have characterized at least one gender related factor in this dimension.

Two male teacher educator/researchers viewed some of our videotapes. Their response was that Virginia and I were too easy on the teachers, that we should confront their arguments to an even greater extent than we were. We can't help but wonder what would have happened had the staff development been facilitated by

males rather than females.

I believe our impression that the empirical evidence teachers used to justify their practices was skimpy and superficial indicates another gender issue. Above I try to make the point that the issue isn't that teachers don't have a theory; rather, teachers haven't been asked. That's true in the larger sense of education. Many teacher education programs "talk at" teachers getting them ready for the classroom. Many staff development programs are designed to transmit information, rather than construct information. If there is one generalization we know about language development, it is that people develop language by using it--if teachers have been silenced, then they haven't had the opportunity to articulate their experience or knowledge. Since the majority of women are teachers and the majority of teacher educators are men, the problem is clear. The relationship may not be causal, but the result is the same: teachers are uncomfortable sharing their experience-related knowledge, and teacher education programs need to respond to that problem.

Finally, I would like to suggest that the very domain of research is a gender issue. Ellen Condliffe Lagemann (1989) articulates the problem well when she compares the influences of Dewey and Judd on education in general and on research. She reports that Judd believed that research should be primarily the domain of men because they were better suited to the careful and scientific nature of research. Teaching, on the other hand, was

better suited to the nurturing nature of women and that teachers should use the results of well designed studies to improve their teaching. Because of Judd's influence on educational research, it is very probable that his beliefs are widely held and greatly influence the context in which we work.

CONGRUENCE AND DISSONANCE

This report seems to suggest several points of congruence and dissonance around the ethics of collaborative research. For example, one point of congruence is the desperate need for school based research within our field. This research needs to ecologically valid, it needs to provide elaborate descriptions of the context and needs to relate to the larger educational community. We need these studies for more reasons than I can list here, but the points made in this paper call for studies that will provide a context for further understanding of teacher's language and the relationship of that language to practice. This study would be best addressed within a collaborative research design.

Another potential point of congruence is the women's movement and collaborative research. It may well be that collaborative research will provide a context for critical feminist theory and criticism to move from first generation notions of assimilation to a new generation that "urges both women and men to place a higher value on the activities traditionally called "women's work" (Noddings, p. 416).

A third point of congruence could evolve from collaborative

research and certain conceptualizations of school restructuring. Hopefully the word is out that changes in curriculum and pedagogy cannot be legislated, that changes need to be constructed by teachers. If that is an operationalized concept, then collaborative research efforts could provide a vehicle for restructuring.

Unfortunately, however there are also several points of dissonance within this framework. For example, Judd and his large family of several generations of positivists are holding on hard to their conceptualization of research. While there are a few brothers and sisters who have left the family fold, others are clinging even more tightly to the canons of the "science of education," that has been the dominate mainstream view of educational researchers. And many who are either in the process of leaving or have left the family are confused and uncertain of our footing. This issue reminds me of the WWII popular song, "Wedding Bells are Breaking Up that Old Gang of Mine." Is collaborative research like the wedding bells of old?

A related dissonant chord in all of this is that there are very few rewards or outlets for the work of collaborative researchers. The traditional school day does not provide time for teachers to collaborate on research projects, and there are few incentives for doing so. Further, the climate of many schools probably discourages those who might be attracted to doing collaborative research. While University professors are rewarded for engaging in research, teachers are not. How can it

be collaboration if there is such inequity? And how important is the "reporting" function of research? How and when are teachers able to engage in writing about and reporting their work?

Another point of dissonance also has a congruent side to it. The funding agency to which we responded and from which we received support seemed to be operating from an empirical/analytic base: i.e. they believed that if teachers would just use the research based practices that all would be well, that children would learn to read. However, the point of congruence is that they accepted our proposal and funded: a project that aspired to be constructivist and potentially collaborative. Does that mean that the winds are shifting? Perhaps by acknowledging, analyzing and discussing the ethics of collaborative research, we and our students will continue to contribute to the development of research perspectives that will provide for all educators voices to be heard.

References

Berthoff, A. (1981). The making of meaning. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Dewey, J. (1929). The quest for certainty. NY: Minton Blach.

Fenstermacher, G D (1986). A philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. 37-49. Third Edition. NY: MacMillan.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Green, T.F. (1971). The activities of teaching. NY: McGraw Hill.

Kamil, M. (1984). Current traditions of reading research. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. 39-62. NY: Longman.

Lagemann, E.C. (1989). The plural worlds of educational research. History of Education Quarterly, 29, 2, 185-214.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Little, (1986). Teachers as colleagues. In V. Koehler (Ed.), Educators handbook: A research perspective. NY: Longman.

McDonald, J.P. (1986). Raising the teacher's voice and the ironic role of theory. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 355-378.

Noddings, N. (1990). Feminist critiques in the professions. In C.B. Cazden (Ed.) Review of Research in Education. 393-424. Washington D.C. American Educational Research Association.

Richardson, V. & Anders, P.L. (1990). Final report: The reading instruction study. Submitted to OERI and ERIC, Grant # G008710014.

Rosenholtz, (1985). Workplace conditions of teacher quality and commitment: Implications for the design of teacher induction programs. Paper presented at the Initial Year of Teaching Conference, sponsored by the University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Education and the Illinois State Board of Education, Chicago, ILL.

Spradley, J.P. (1979).The ethnographic interview. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Table 1
Summary Table:
Comparison of Practice Sources

Focus	TCH Reported	Teacher Literature articles/practices	Empirical Literature studies/practices
Vocabulary		31/22(23.2%)	46/13(18.1%)
BK	4 (09%)	24/12(12.6%)	19/09(12.5%)
Text	2 (04%)	21/13(13.7%)	43/15(20.8%)
Tchr/Text Ques	7 (16%)	03/02 (2.1%)	12/06 (8.3%)
Self Gen Ques	7 (16%)	12/04 (4.2%)	09/04 (5.6%)
Modality	3 (08%)	19/12(12.6%)	07/04 (5.6%)
Motivation	10 (23%)	N	01/01 (1.4%)
Visualization	1 (02%)	06/03 (3.2%)	15/04 (5.6%)
Rdng & Wrtng	2 (04%)	22/15(15.8%)	25/05 (6.9%)
Attn & Selection	2 (04%)	N	12/05 (6.9%)
Crit Rdng	3 (08%)	04/03 (3.2%)	01/01 (1.4%)
Fluency	1 (02%)	N	N
Self Mon/Meta	0	16/09 (9.5%)	08/05 (6.9%)
Lit Grps	2 (04%)	N	01/01 (1.4%)
Total	44 practices	158/95	199/73

Table 2

Presentation of Practices by Participant

School	Respondent	SH	ST	L1	L2	NW	Total
A	Teacher	21	12	2	2	3	40
	Staff Dev	4	--	4	7	2	17
F	Teacher	19	6	--	--	1	26
	Staff Dev	2	2	3	7	2	16

SH = Shared ST = Show and Tell L1 = Lecture 1
L2 = Lecture 2 NW = New

In analyzing the follow-up to practice description, some significant differences emerged. Figure 6.2 summarizes these

Table 3

PERCENTAGE OF TIME: STAFF DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES

Session	School A (in %) SDT	SDITT	TITT	DISC	School F (in %) SDT	SDITT	TITT	DISC
1	66	7	1	25	67	18	0	15
2	22	36	5	37	15	10	13	62
3	23	29	7	41	30	12	16	35
4	61	9	5	25	40	8	27	25
5	28	7	13	51	27	2	17	55
6	9	11	26	54	15	3	25	57
7	27	15	12	44	14	0	12	74
8	23	10	25	42	13	0	14	72
9	9	4	6	80				
10	36	1	31	32				
11	15	5	5	75				

SDT = Staff Developer Talk
SDITT = Staff Developer Initiated Teacher Talk
TITT = Teacher Initiated Teacher Talk
DISC = Discussion

Table 3

PERCENTAGE OF TIME: STAFF DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES

Session	School A (in %) SDT	SDITT	TITT	DISC	School F (in %) SDT	SDITT	TITT	DISC
1	66	7	1	25	67	18	0	15
2	22	36	5	37	15	10	13	62
3	23	29	7	41	30	12	16	35
4	61	9	5	25	40	8	27	25
5	28	7	13	51	27	2	17	55
6	9	11	26	54	15	3	25	57
7	27	15	12	44	14	0	12	74
8	23	10	25	42	13	0	14	72
9	9	4	6	80				
10	36	1	31	32				
11	15	5	5	75				

SDT = Staff Developer Talk
SDITT = Staff Developer Initiated Teacher Talk
TITT = Teacher Initiated Teacher Talk
DISC = Discussion